UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,436	07/31/2003	Sambit Kumar Dash	07844-601001	4545
21876 FISH & RICHA	7590 08/25/200 ARDSON P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. Box 1022		HARRISON, CHANTE E		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/633,436	DASH, SAMBIT KUMAR		
Examiner	Art Unit		
CHANTE HARRISON	2628		

	CHANTE HARRISON	2020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropria	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	·	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re-	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	serresponding number of finding reju	solod ciairrio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOI -324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane, anonamone (1 1 0 2 0 2 1 //
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	onazion ouzimitou in a coparato,	annony mod annonamo.	it carrooming the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowan	ce because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: 	Г10/35/06) Paper No(s)		
	/Chante Harrison/		
	Examiner, Art Unit 2628		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues Yanagisawa fails to teach overlap of tracking zones. Yanagisawa teaches an erasure area the size of an input point (col. 4, II. 20-25). Yanagisawa discloses upon detecting an erase mode, a sampling point to be erased is identified by determining the input points affected by motion of the pen input (col. 4, II. 32-41, 52-59), where fast pen motion may increase the size of the erasure area (col. 5, II. 20-22, 29-31) when the deletion of multiple points is desired. When pen motion increases the size of the erasure area neighboring input points that are affected by the change in size of the initial input point erasure area are identified and erased (col. 5, II. 5-14). Yanagisawa teaches during erasure the erasure areas of input points are coupled. Thus, Yanagisawa's coupling of an enlarged erasure area of an input point with a neighboring input point erasure area suggests overlap of tracking zones as the contact between neighboring erasure areas indicates the effect of deletion at the point. Applicant argues a response to the arguments was not found in the Final Rejection. Examiner notes the response to arguments with respect to Applicant's example referencing claim 6, similarly correspond to those of claim 1. Additionally, the claim elements were addressed in the rejection, which Applicant's arguments do not overcome.

Applicant argues Yanagisawa does not teach specifying a tracking zone insides the influence region of the location and outside the influence region of the previous location. Yanagisawa teaches an input point having an erasure area of a particular shape. Yanagisawa teaches upon detection of erasure mode tracking pen motion input, such that slow pen motion input sets the erasure area at an input point smaller to erase a fine and narrow input point without erasing a neighboring point (col. 5,II. 20-30). Thus, Yanagisawa's erasing a point having a smaller erasure area without erasing a neighboring point teaches a tracking zone that is inside the influence region of one location and outside the influence region of a previous location.